



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

JO
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,006	02/04/2004	Donald R. Miles SR.	DRM-101	5363
30869	7590	08/24/2004	EXAMINER	
LUMEN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SERVICES, INC. 2345 YALE STREET, 2ND FLOOR PALO ALTO, CA 94306				NORMAN, MARC E
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3744		

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/773,006	MILES, DONALD R.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marc E. Norman	3744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 9-16 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 2 and 4 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/4/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pointer (U.S. Patent 5,297,397).

As per claim 1, Pointer discloses

- refrigerant fluid inlet line 12, refrigerant heat exchanger (part of supplemental condenser 100), refrigerant fluid state sensor (compressor discharge sensing of pressure operated valve 108 – see column 4, lines 12-24), and a refrigerant fluid outlet 19;
- water inlet 31, control valve 108, water heat exchanger (part of supplemental condenser 100), and water outlet 32;
- the control valve 108 being controlled according to the sensed condition such that water flow is increased when the sensed condition (refrigerant pressure) rises, and is reduced when the condition drops (column 5, lines 33-44).

As per claim 3, Pointer discloses the refrigerant and water traveling in the same direction (from left to right within condenser 100 as shown in Figure 2).

As per claim 5, Pointer discloses the sensor providing on-off outputs (i.e., from 0% to 100% - see column 5, lines 33-37)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pointer.

As per claim 6, Pointer does not specifically teach valve 108 being a solenoid valve.

However, solenoid valves are extremely well-known and commonly applied within refrigeration systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a solenoid valve within the system of Pointer for the purpose of taking advantage of the well-known control efficiencies that solenoid valves provide.

As per claims 7 and 8, Pointer does not teach a warning indicator light. However, warning indicator lights are common and well-known features of refrigeration control systems.

Furthermore, as written in the claims, there is no direct control connection between the indicator and fluid control arrangement. The indicator lights could be for a completely unrelated feature. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a warning indicator light to the system of Pointer for the purpose of indicating that the sensed compressor discharge pressure (or any other system parameter, whether related or unrelated) is outside of a desired operating range.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9-16 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As per claim 2, the prior art does not teach the threshold-based control of the water control valve.

As per claims 4 and 9-16, the prior art (and Pointer in particular) does not teach the refrigerant fluid state sensor being positioned downstream from the refrigerant fluid heat exchange section.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 703-305-2711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:00-5:30, with first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Denise Esquivel can be reached on 703-308-2597. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN



MARc NORMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER